

LUCIE PROHIN

Rhetorics of love in the field of working-class housing in nineteenth-century Europe

INTERSTICES 23

Introduction

At first glance, nineteenth-century working-class dwellings might seem quite far from the idea of love. Admittedly, a few theorists of the period who tackled the question of housing, such as Charles Fourier,¹ did grant feelings, including feelings of love, a meaningful place in their line of thought. But overall, the accommodations specifically designed for the working classes could be seen as the opposite of an architecture of love: their construction has often been deemed the result of an economic necessity for industrialists² or a public health imperative for hygienists, motivations that often intertwined with a desire for social control of the populations concerned.³

Yet during this same period, conversations surrounding working-class housing regularly invoked the notion of love. Indeed, in the second half of the nineteenth century, the issue of workers' dwellings was the subject of countless publications. These varied in type (from expository to argumentative) and emanated from many different actors, including architects, engineers, industrialists, philanthropists,⁴ social investigators,⁵ and reformers. Such writings do not enable us to discern all the motivations that drove these people, but nonetheless prove valuable sources for perceiving the ones they wished to put forward publicly or that observers chose to highlight.

Since the 1960s, many scholars have studied these writings and analysed discourse on working-class housing. Hoping to draw up an exhaustive historiographical review of this question would thus be illusory, but it does seem important to highlight some of these studies. One could, for instance, think of Roger-Henri Guerrand's use of printed sources in his work *The Origins of Social Housing in France*, published in 1967.⁶ A few years later, John Nelson Tarn⁷ and Enid Gaudie⁸ tackled this same topic but focused on the United Kingdom, while Marcel Smets studied the Belgian case, explaining, in 1977, that he wanted to "confront [...] the reciprocal relationships of facts, declarations and achievements to give an overview of the main motivations and ideologies that have dominated thought on social housing."⁹ Over the same period, especially from the 1970s onwards, the interrelation between space and social control was the subject of numerous developments in scientific literature, partly echoing studies on housing

from the industrial period. Here too, the writings of the dominant classes on working-class dwellings were dissected, as many point to the moralising charge intended to impart to the domestic environment.¹⁰ In France, several research reports on the history of housing carried out during that period (1970s–1980s) on behalf of public institutions focused on the study of printed sources, analysing the relationship between “the social project, elaborated in discourse, and the spatial project, materialised in drawings or in reality.”¹¹ This paper follows in the footsteps of these pioneering studies in working-class housing research. I do not focus on a particular nation but mobilise examples from several European countries. In that sense, I am indebted to the comparative studies of the late twentieth century, which contrasted several housing reform movements in varied Western nations.¹² Moreover, although the question of transnational exchange will not appear explicitly in this paper, it is worth keeping in mind that many of the writings analysed did circulate beyond national borders. The emergence of transnational networks of actors and circulations of ideas in social reform has already been evidenced by several studies from the late 1990s and 2000s onwards,¹³ particularly in housing.¹⁴

Over and above this rich historiography that feeds my research, I draw on a specific methodological approach: *critical discourse analysis*, which analyses discourse as “the instrument of power and control as well as [...] the instrument of the social construction of reality.”¹⁵ This lens was directly applied to architecture in the early 2000s by Thomas A. Markus and Deborah Cameron, who, in their book *The Words Between the Spaces*, briefly examined a report on workers’ dwellings dating from 1918.¹⁶ Generally speaking, discourse on housing has been the subject of numerous articles, often dealing with more contemporary times.¹⁷

In short, this paper is in conversation with a vast historiography on working-class and social housing and mobilises a methodology already used in this field. But it focuses on a so far understudied notion: to my knowledge, no study has taken an in-depth look at the mentions of the term “love” in the discourse on workers’ dwellings in the nineteenth century. I hypothesise that analysing the uses of that notion will enable us to build hitherto little-explored bridges between different political and social stakes relating to the question of working-class housing at the confluence of three distinct spheres: individual, family, and nation.

This paper thus analyses several types of writings (treatises, reports, texts from society newsletters) published on that issue in various European countries during the second half of the nineteenth century. Without pretending to draw up a complete panorama of the publications that have included this term, which would be impossible given the number of studies published on working-class housing during this period, the aim is to develop a typology of rhetorical uses of “love” and question their architectural and spatial implications. To this end, I leave room for long quotations while proposing to recontextualise them and make them resonate with each other, thus questioning how these uses of love differ or converge from one decade and country to another.

1. Love as cause

Discourses related to workers’ dwellings often cited love as a motivating factor justifying the interest people had in this issue. This was particularly true for those often labelled as “philanthropists,” which is far from surprising given that

the Greek roots of “philanthropy” directly refer to the “love of humanity.” In 1899, for instance, when the Reverend George T. Lemmon mentioned Octavia Hill and George Peabody, two of the best-known philanthropists of the late nineteenth century particularly active in the field of working-class housing, he explained that it was their “love” that “brought hope into the crowded tenement districts of London and thence to all great cities.”¹⁸ Social reformers and industrialists themselves also invoked love as a motive. It should, however, be highlighted that this feeling was often not aimed at the entire working-class population but more specifically at those who “deserved” it, as evidenced by the vast scholarship on the notion of the “deserving poor.”¹⁹

I will tackle this first use of the notion only briefly, as numerous studies have already examined the concepts of philanthropy, patronage, and paternalism,²⁰ looking at the often-intertwined motivations of those involved in the improvement of the working classes’ living conditions and questioning the reception of their actions. This paper nevertheless provides an opportunity to highlight a few key points on how dominant classes summoned the term “love” to describe their relationship with workers and especially to question the religious subtext of this notion.

Although we often regard the second half of the nineteenth century as a period of progressive secularisation in Europe, Christian morality did seem to play a crucial part in the association between the idea of “doing good” and the notion of love, along the line of what is described in the Bible as one of the most important commandments, “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.”²¹ English writer Arthur Helps²² even argued in his 1844 *Essay on the Duties of the Employers to the Employed* that the construction of workers’ cottages could evoke that of a cathedral.

*The devout feeling which in former days raised august cathedrals throughout the land, might find an employment to the full as religious in building a humble row of cottages, if they tell of honour to the great Creator, in care for those whom he has bidden us to take care for, and are thus silently dedicated, as it were, to His name.*²³

In 1870, in a study devoted to working-class well-being, French Abbé (*abbot*) Jean-Baptiste Tounissoux also drew a direct link between the Christian faith and the material aid given to the working classes by the more affluent.

One fact tending to become more apparent than ever is the effectiveness of Christian beliefs in bringing the hearts of rich and poor closer together. With rare exceptions, *rich people who are sincerely Christian love the worker*, and are happy to help him morally and materially.²⁴

Although Tounissoux emphasised that men of “no faith” could also be concerned with the welfare of workers, he drew a, albeit questionable, distinction between their deep-rooted motivations and those of Christian philanthropists, defending the idea that only the latter were motivated by love, when, in contrast, the “materialists” cared for the working-class “in order to obtain crosses of honour” and “to make a higher position for themselves.”²⁵

Nonetheless, references to the notion of “love” were far from limited to texts whose authors emanated from the clergy. One could take the example of a speech given by Émile Cheysson, a French engineer and social reformer, at the

Third International Congress of Low-Cost Housing (*congrès international des habitations à bon marché*) held in Bordeaux in 1895. His words were reported in the *Bulletin* of the *Société française des habitations à bon marché* (SFHBM), an organisation founded in 1889 that was behind the 1894 law (also known as “loi Siegfried”), which inaugurated the timid beginnings of public intervention in proto-social housing in France.

In certain resounding congresses, in certain meetings, which I don't need to name further, one could have written on the door of the session room: Here, we hate. [...] Not us. *What inspires us is, in the words of the first President, the affection of our fellow human beings; it is the love of all those who suffer and whose situation we want to improve at all costs.* The holy books say that love is stronger than death; I believe it is also stronger than hate. By loving, we will disarm. We will counter hateful declamations with factual teaching, and *when France, thanks to this beneficent law, so justly praised, will be covered with houses, [...] I believe that the promoters of hatred will not have much of a chance.*²⁶

It would, however, be erroneous to think that adherence to the Christian religion was seen as a *sine qua non* for the love of one's fellow human beings. During the same congress, French jurist and historian Georges Picot announced the SFHBM's intention to launch a survey of housing in France, and when mentioning the need to hire investigators for that purpose, he specified that:

First and foremost, in the broadest sense of the word, we need men of goodwill, i.e. men who care very little for themselves, who do not seek their own immediate interests, *who love goodness for the intimate satisfaction it brings, and who have a high degree of love for their fellow human beings.* Such men exist; it is necessary to find them. *It doesn't matter what rank they occupy in society, what their usual functions are, what their opinions are, what their religious beliefs are.* Only one question needs to be asked: are they sincerely devoted to the good, without any ulterior motive?²⁷

One could argue that Picot's openness was not without calculation. The aim was to recruit people to carry out the survey, and it would thus have been counterproductive to address only Christians. But the French low-cost housing movement did indeed bring together many people of different religious denominations (among which Catholics, such as Émile Cheysson; Protestants, such as Jules Siegfried; or Jews, such as the heads of the Rothschild Foundation).²⁸ This echoes Christian Topalov's recent study on “the social worlds of Paris charities” around 1900, which clearly shows that the SFHBM was one of the charitable organisations that displayed a certain “neutrality” in matters of religion.²⁹

Love was, of course, not the sole motive invoked. In 1907, in the preface for a book on public insalubrity and expropriation,³⁰ Cheysson argued that the “war on slums” (*guerre au taudis*) was as much a matter of “love of humanity” as it was one of “social preservation” since unhealthy housing could widely spread both germs of disease, and of social unrest.³¹ Moreover, it is clear from reading various printed sources that many authors aimed to convince capitalists of the benefits of taking better care of workers and their housing conditions by appealing to their business sense and not just their good feelings. This was, for instance, explicitly demonstrated by English writer and reformer James Hole in 1866.

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the old teaching of “love your neighbour as yourself,” of “doing unto others as you would be done unto,” are antiquated, if not obsolete doctrines, superseded by the new lights of “supply and demand,” “buying in the cheapest market,” etc., we do not ask the capitalist to pay one farthing more wages than those fixed by the most rigorous competition, yet he might easily effect a vast improvement in the homes of his workpeople, and so in their general condition, by devoting a very little attention to that subject. [...] If his workpeople have to walk a considerable distance to their work, the mere loss of physical energy and effectiveness is considerable in the course of a year. If they are badly housed, he will lose much in their absence through sickness, and still more by their idleness and wastefulness, the result of their low moral feeling and want of self-respect. Large factory owners have often admitted that whatever they have spent in improving the education and social condition of their workpeople, has been a most profitable investment; and surely, among all the positive conditions of improvement, none are so powerful as a clean, comfortable, and healthy dwelling.³²

Far from the notion of love, some publications thus highlighted direct associations between workers' well-being and economic profit. However, when profit was the only motive, it meant another kind of love; a love of gain was taking over, leading some speculative builders to make architectural choices that proved disastrous for the inhabitants. It is what French jurist Antony Roulliet, also involved in the SFHBM, underlined in 1889 when discussing the case of the city of Lille in northern France:

From 1856 onwards, as the city grew, it became possible to think about housing for the less well-off, but the *love of gain* led some owners to create poorly ventilated dwellings or workers' housing estates which have been criticised.³³

On the contrary, when those involved were keen to provide quality housing for workers, they sought out the best possible architectural type, which, again, according to Roulliet, was the individual house.

The cellar in Lille has thus been replaced, or at least will be to some extent, by *the detached house, the type lovingly pursued by the apostles of healthy, low-cost housing.*³⁴

An unequivocal link was, therefore, often established between the personal motivations of the developers and the architectural form and spatial layout of the dwellings built for the working classes. Furthermore, the architecture of the dwellings was itself supposed to be able to develop feelings of love within the workers, which is the issue this paper will now focus on.

2. Love as consequence

2.1 Building morality through dwellings: From love of home to the respect of oneself

I am not interested in the vague mentions of the notion of love that were sometimes made by some authors, such as French theorist Georges Benoît-Lévy when he visited the garden cities in Milanino, on the outskirts of Milan, which

he described as “a city of peace and love.”³⁵ Instead, I am concerned with a more precise concept, that of “love of the hearth” or “love of the home”³⁶ (in English), “amour du foyer” (in French), or “Liebe zum eigenen Herd” (in German). In France, it was mentioned several times by the architect Eugène Viollet-le-Duc in his eighteenth *Entretiens sur l'architecture*,³⁷ when he emphasised his clear preference for single-family dwellings.

Some well-meaning people believe, with some basis in fact, that *the appearance of the premises has an influence on the mores of the inhabitants*. If this observation is correct, we must agree that nothing is better suited to demoralise a population than *these large rented houses, in which the personality of the individual is erased and where it is hardly possible to admit the love of home* and, consequently, the benefits that derive from it. [...] The private home, on the other hand, however modest it may be, always bears the imprint of its owner's habits. [...] Man always takes an affection for what he believes he has created, and this affection, when it attaches itself to the domestic home, is healthy. In my opinion, therefore, the tendency of a significant proportion of the public to abandon rented houses for private dwellings cannot be overly encouraged, and to some extent it depends on architects to help this evolution in mores, by studying the most economical means of enabling mediocre fortunes to settle in private homes.³⁸

The semantic field of “morality” is crucial here, as for many authors, ensuring a worker's attachment to his home would lead him to develop, or reinforce, moral behaviour and thus to detach himself from activities deemed reprehensible, such as the frequenting of drinking establishments. Scientific literature on industrial housing has already largely analysed this dimension of social control. In addition to the studies mentioned in the introduction, one could, for instance, think of Fani Kostourou's recent article on the Mulhouse *cités ouvrières* (workers' housing estates located in the east of France), which tackled these very issues, coining the expression “social reform follows housing” (or “moral reform follows domestic reform”).³⁹

Continuing this line of reasoning, I argue that studying the uses of the term “love” offers an operative lens to understand better one aspect of the reasoning behind the link forged in the nineteenth century between housing and the morality of the working class. It is indeed quite striking to realise that, during this period, many authors explicitly associated the feeling of love with the idea of “home” but also with what they perceived to be grand moral principles such as “work” or “order.” In all these cases, the construction of morality in the workers involved awakening their own feelings, rather than forcing them to act morally.⁴⁰ Instilling, through the influence of their dwellings, a deep desire to behave in this way, and in the end, to respect and even love themselves. Austrian Ludwig Klasen's description of the Stracig workers' colony built by Ritter, Rittmeyer & Cie provides an obvious illustration of that mechanism:

The impression that everyone receives when looking at the houses and apartments of this colony is that of a friendly comfort, *which is quite suitable to evoke the love of one's own hearth in the workers and to awaken a sense of order and cleanliness*.⁴¹

In that sense, Klasen's empirical observation strongly echoed Viollet-le-Duc's theoretical considerations:

*From love of home comes love of work, order and wise economy. So we need to make people love the home, make it attainable for as many people as possible, and do our utmost to solve this problem. The architect could not set himself a nobler task.*⁴²

On the architectural front, just as Antony Roulliet expressed his love for the *maison isolée* (isolated house) and as Viollet-le-Duc spoke of his general preference for the *maison privée* (private house) over the *maison à loyers* (rental buildings), many people involved in the field of working-class housing also asserted the moral superiority of this type of accommodation.⁴³ This was, for instance, the case in Mulhouse in the early 1850s, before the actual construction of the *cités ouvrières* began.⁴⁴ Consensus was not, however, general, and that question was the subject of numerous debates because of its social and political implications. I will focus on another example, namely the discussions that took place within the Association française pour l'avancement des sciences (French Association for the Advancement of Science) in 1886 when publicist and economist Arthur Raffalovich presented his work on working-class dwellings in the United States. Discussing this study, which tackled the issue of single-family homes, some members of the association expressed the concern that the workers' attachment to a small house would hinder their freedom of movement, both in physical and financial terms. In addition, Charles Mathieu Limousin,⁴⁵ a worker, journalist, and labour activist, considered individual dwellings too narrow and flimsy and explained that he preferred the more "monumental" system of the Familistère of Guise, a collective housing complex in northern France inspired by Charles Fourier's phalanstery, which began construction in the north of France in 1858. Conversely, historian and economist Émile Levasseur invoked the notion of "love" to state that:

It is good to be at home, *the love of property exists in the worker as in all men; the working-class family that has its own house is more interested in its interior, which it arranges to its own liking, and in the little patch of garden that it cultivates; large, well-ordered working-class houses such as the Familistère de Guise are very useful for the well-being of workers. However [...] the small house owned by the worker [is] superior, especially from a moral point of view.*⁴⁶

2.2 Strengthening the keystone of social order: From love of home to love of family

Levasseur's mention of the "working-class family" is far from anecdotal. Indeed, if a connection was established between the worker's love of home and virtuous conduct, both were linked to harmony among working-class families. The construction of dwellings for the workers was indeed regularly presented as the cement of the family structure, as explicitly stated in a study by Swiss scientist Johann Jakob Balmer-Rinck, according to whom "the most beautiful and ideal goal of the construction of workers' housing always remains the spiritually ennobling influence that the home of a family is able to exert on its members."⁴⁷ Tellingly, in French, the term "foyer" originally refers to a place for cooking, like "hearth" in English or "Herd" in German, but by metonymy, it also designates the family itself.

Attachment to the home was often presented as a consequence of the construction of model dwellings. However, according to numerous authors, its

development did not solely depend on the developers' decisions, for the love of home did not simply call for attention to architectural form, internal distribution, or spatial layout. From the 1890s onwards, particular emphasis was placed on the importance of the interior design of the accommodations, especially how furniture was to be arranged by the workers themselves. Georges Picot, for example, pointed out in 1901, on the occasion of the inauguration of houses built in the suburbs of Paris by a low-cost housing company aptly named "La Famille" ("The Family").

You will have all these satisfactions, gentlemen, in these charming houses that your skilful architect, Mr Coutelet, has built with as much art as taste. Visiting them a few moments ago, I noticed that even before they were completely finished, the future owners had taken possession of the walls, covering them with paintings and engravings, and *arranging their furniture with a happy harmony that reveals their love of home at first glance*. Not only will the new inhabitants enter with joy, but *they will become attached to their home; they will love it*, it will become a part of their lives; they will see in it the extension of their existence, more certain to last than themselves.⁴⁸

The underlying aim was not only to foster an instinct for property ownership, but also to encourage the working class to develop an emotional relationship with their home and a sense of responsibility towards it. At the turn of the century, it seems some authors wished to bring workers closer to a more *bourgeois* ideal of life, moving away from monotonous working-class housing estates towards individual accommodation offering a distinctly personal character, even though this model was obviously not financially accessible to all workers. In 1892, for instance, one could read an article about German working-class dwellings published in the French architectural journal *La Construction Moderne*.

The "cité ouvrière," as it was understood just a few years ago by the big industrialists, has not always produced the results expected of it. The family was too much confined to a monotonous, uniform setting [...]. Today, we strive to give the home some variety, to isolate it, to give it a little personal character. [...] Having long noted the moralising effect of property on the poor family, *we are now striving to increase this effect by developing its aesthetic feeling to the same extent as its love of home*.⁴⁹

At the time, the work of enhancing the dwelling was presented as relying mainly on women, just as numerous studies⁵⁰ have already analysed the working-class "home" as a woman's realm in the nineteenth century. The wives were indeed considered responsible for "keeping" their husbands at home, away from the pub, as stated by Roulliet when referring to the houses built for miners in Anzin (northern France):

[...] *the cleanliness of the home is, in fact, the first condition of the love it brings with it*; at Anzin, where everyone is at home, life is a little solitary. *It is up to the wife to make the interior pleasant and to keep her husband there*; it has been rightly said that the mother is a school, *and it can be argued that the wife is and remains the attraction of the home*.⁵¹

Beyond the interior of the dwelling, the garden was seen as another element to transform and elevate working-class families on a moral level. Writing about the "Arbeiterkolonie" in Esslingen (Germany) in 1882, French economist René

Lavollée pointed out, for instance, that “the gardens bear the imprint of the love with which their owners cultivate them.”⁵² As the movement to develop allotments gathered momentum from the end of the nineteenth century onwards, numerous publications were issued on the subject, affirming the importance of these spaces for the moralisation of working-class families. French writer Louis Rivière emphasised the “healthy” spirit of competition that could develop between neighbours and the opportunity that the garden gave the father of the family to pass on practical knowledge, which echoes recent scholarship on the question of fatherhood in working-class homes.⁵³

Emulation soon sets in among neighbours: first, you want your vegetables to be as beautiful as the others, and then you want them to be the most beautiful. And *this feeling of self-esteem soon transcends the small gated barriers to transform the whole of life. The family is reconstituted.* Earlier we saw the child working alongside his father, receiving his advice, getting used to asking for it when he’s in trouble, and learning respect in the process.⁵⁴

In all these texts, the two connected forms of love—love of home and love of family—were more or less explicitly presented as conditions to maintain social order. Fostering love through architecture, interior decoration, and garden cultivation thus appeared as a means of controlling the working-class population and its aspirations from the youngest age, generation after generation, as stated in several articles from the SFHBM’s *Bulletin*:

Workers on their way to owning a healthy home with a small garden become attached to the soil they cultivate, to the house they improve, become far-sighted and develop a taste for economy. *Children raised in this environment retain a love of home and respect for their parents.*⁵⁵

*If the worker is content in his own home, the love of the family, an essential principle of morality, can germinate in the hearts; instead of remembering the paternal dwelling with horror, as they sometimes do, the children, when they have left it, will like to evoke the sweet image of the family home. It will be a comfort to them, and they will want to build a similar home of their own, where they can become good people and good citizens.*⁵⁶

This agenda was precisely what some socialist thinkers, such as Engels,⁵⁷ were contesting. As I have already mentioned, the “housing question” was indeed the focus of numerous ideological clashes at the time.

2.3 Fostering patriotism: From love of home to love of homeland

These political implications are reflected in another use of the notion of love. In addition to leading to family harmony, love of home was also regularly associated with love of the homeland. Elsa Vonau has already highlighted this shift in her study of garden cities at the beginning of the twentieth century, where she notably discussed the debates surrounding the Erbbaurecht in Germany and explained that during this time, “Häuslichkeitsliebe” (“love of domesticity”) was often conflated with “Vaterlandsliebe” (“love of the fatherland”).⁵⁸ But this association between the two forms of love was already very present in the nineteenth century: as early as 1840, in *The Old Curiosity Shop*, Dickens wrote: “In love of home, the love of country has its rise.”⁵⁹

Similarly, in the first decade of the twentieth century, French economist Auguste Béchaux' notion of love of home referred to very concrete political issues, and in particular, to an outspoken rejection of socialism:

For us, the domestic home—the “Heim”, as the Germans call it—not only has an incomparable charm, so much so that what is “heimlich” always holds and delights us; *but love of home is also love of country*, and we pity the “heimatlos” who knows no national ties, because all too often he will not have known domestic ties; he is “without fire or place.” So why are we surprised that he's an internationalist and a collectivist?⁶⁰

At that time in France, many of those involved in the *habitations à bon marché* (low-cost homes) movement regularly claimed that their actions could keep workers away from the “seducing, yet cruelly deceptive utopias” of socialism.⁶¹ There is nothing new here; as has already been pointed out, these ideological disputes were already evident in the mid-nineteenth century, particularly in discussions about preferable types of housing, the single-family home or apartment blocks. But at the turn of the twentieth century in France, no doubt partly due to the slow institutionalisation of this field, this type of argument regained momentum in a very explicit and pressing way, which is particularly evident when reviewing the various speeches reported in the SFHBM's *Bulletin*.

The development of a love of home among the working-class was often seen as a source of international competition. Once again taking France as an example, one can see authors such as Alfred de Foville priding themselves on the specific attachment that would clearly bind the French to their home, supposedly setting them apart from other nationalities emigrating overseas:

However low the French birth rate may be, there is no shortage of poor, very poor people in our countryside who might be tempted to seek their fortune across the seas, as so many Irish, so many Germans, so many Italians do. But who knows if what drives these Italians, Germans and Irish to leave is not precisely the ambition and hope of finally having a home of their own? *The love of the home they dream of outweighs, at some point, the love of country. The French peasant, having a home of his own right here, the fatherland and the home agree to hold him back: and he stays.*⁶²

And yet, in many French texts, it was not always the French term “foyer” that was used, but also that of “home,” especially from the 1900s onwards.⁶³ This notion was not translated; indeed, it has no exact translation in French. It was also rarely explicitly defined, and seemed to refer to a more encompassing approach to domestic space but also more directly to the living experience of the British and maybe, to a lesser extent, the Americans. Their relationship with their home thus often appears as a source of envy for some French authors, and interestingly, quite a similar phenomenon could be observed in Germany at the turn of the twentieth century, as recently evidenced by Isabel Rousset⁶⁴ when discussing Hermann Muthesius's *Das englische Haus*. In France, ten years before de Foville, art critic Émile Cardon indeed lamented:

*Foreigners have, more than we do today, this love of the domestic home that we once had and which we lost, alas, a long time ago. It is in our interest to get back to it, because it is love of family and home that makes for love of country and the great national virtues, so necessary to a nation as tried and tested as we have been.*⁶⁵

He once again asserted the importance of women's domestic work:

It is undoubtedly women who will make the greatest contribution to achieving this goal. It is, we are convinced, the woman who first has the instinct for the good and the beautiful, who will most actively put into practice the advice designed to transform her interior; *it is she who will devote herself to this task and pursue it with perseverance, if only to make her husband and children love the home more*, and keep them there longer.⁶⁶

Cardon's book did not specifically discuss the decoration of working-class dwellings, but he did insist that these desirable interior improvements were within everyone's financial reach, arguing that it was "not even a question of money" and that all it took to transform one's home was "strong will and perseverance."⁶⁷ In France, this can be directly linked to the development, at the end of the nineteenth century, of initiatives to encourage "art for all" and the tasteful furnishing and decoration of *habitations à bon marché* in the vein of the Arts and Crafts movement, which was promoted by authors such as Henri Cazalis (under the pseudonym Jean Lahor).⁶⁸ This period saw the emergence of specialised periodicals such as *Ma Petite Maison* ("My Little House"), in which the link between "love of home" and the prosperity of the nation was also explicitly drawn:

The home is, in fact, the stable element of any family, the centre where a line of beings can grow and prosper. *The love of home, the desire for well-being, the principles of economy, are the essential factors in the happiness of peoples, and the great nations of today are those where the feeling of family and the love of home are best developed.* [...] A nation is only as great as the strength of its children. A family is prosperous only through the love of home.⁶⁹

Finally, the political stakes involved in home ownership could have consequences for the way in which the housing construction process was approached. My final example is that of the workers' houses built for railway workers in the suburbs of Lyon, for which the opinions of future owners were sought. When they were inaugurated in 1892, Émile Cheysson commented on the extent to which this method of joint conception could reinforce national feeling:

An Italian economist, Vigano, claimed that each of us has small homelands concentric with the big one, and that *the love we feel for our favourite chair is also part of patriotism*. How much truer is this joke—profound in its humorous form—for the house we own, which also owns us! *This truth is even truer, if possible, when each family has been involved, as here, in the construction of its home.*⁷⁰

Conclusion

This paper highlights the many links that can be woven between the notion of love and the question of working-class housing in the second half of the nineteenth century. Interestingly, relatively few changes appear in the discourses over the period studied, except perhaps for a greater focus on the interior design of dwellings at the end of the period.

By bringing together mentions of love from different publications, I have put together a varied kaleidoscope. Still, two points are important to emphasise. First, it seems crucial not to smooth out the differences in approach, intention,

and thought of these numerous authors. Although I have tried to provide context for the main text excerpts examined, an extensively detailed analysis would be beyond the scope of this paper. Second, this research should not lead to overestimating the importance of the notion of love in discourses on working-class housing. Despite its presence in a variety of texts, it often occupied a fairly marginal place and was, of course, absent from many other writings.

In any case, analysing the question of workers' dwellings through the prism of the notion of love appears to be an operative heuristic tool for studying the eminently political role played by this subject in the nineteenth century and for highlighting the social control intentions of many actors in the field, hence consolidating and deepening the results of numerous previous studies on these issues, while revealing new research perspectives. This notion of control seems fundamental because, even though these discourses often talked of encouraging workers to make their homes their own or even to involve them in their conception, an underlying goal of maintaining social order almost always appeared to be at play. This once again reaffirms the importance of language as an instrument of power. The mention of feelings was never anecdotal but hinted at the will many people from the dominant classes had to permeate not only the workers' homes and families but also, to a certain extent, the workers' minds.

NOTES

1. Hansun Hsiung, "From Harmony to eHarmony: Charles Fourier, Social Science, and the Management of Love," *Isis* 112, no. 4 (2021): 786–94.
 2. See, for instance, Sidney Pollard, "The Factory Village in the Industrial Revolution," *The English Historical Review* LXXIX, no. 312 (1964): 513–31.
 3. Ann-Louise Shapiro, "Housing Reform in Paris: Social Space and Social Control," *French Historical Studies* 12, no. 4 (1982): 486–507.
 4. On the links between philanthropy and housing, see, for instance, John Nelson Tarn, *Five Per Cent Philanthropy. An Account of Housing in Urban Areas Between 1840 and 1914* (London, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1973). About philanthropy at the turn of the century, see Christian Topalov (ed.), *Philanthropes en 1900. Londres, New York, Paris, Genève* (Grâne: Créaphis, 2020).
 5. Regarding the role of social investigators, see, for instance, François Jarrige and Thomas Le Roux, "Naissance de l'enquête: les hygiénistes, Villermé et les ouvriers autour de 1840," in Éric Geerkens, Nicolas Hatzfeld, Isabelle Lespinet-Moret, and Xavier Vigna, *Les enquêtes ouvrières dans l'Europe contemporaine* (Paris, Fr: La Découverte, 2019): 39–52.
 6. Roger-Henri Guerrand, *Les origines du logement social en France* (Paris, Fr: Les Éditions ouvrières, 1967).
 7. John Nelson Tarn, *Working-Class Housing in 19th-Century Britain* (London, UK: Lund Humphries for the Architectural Association, 1971).
 8. Enid Gaudie, *Cruel Habitations: A History of Working-Class Housing, 1780–1918* (London, UK: G. Allen and Unwin, 1974).
 9. Marcel Smets, *L'avènement de la cité-jardin en Belgique: histoire de l'habitat social en Belgique de 1830 à 1930* (Brussels, BE: Mardaga, 1977), 6: "confronter [...] les relations réciproques des faits, des déclarations et des réalisations pour donner un aperçu des motivations principales et des idéologies qui ont dominé la réflexion sur le logement social." [author's translation]
 10. See, for instance, Michel Foucault (ed.), *Politiques de l'habitat, 1800–1850* [research report for the Comité pour la recherche et le développement en architecture (CORDA)], 1977; Robin Evans, "Rookeries and Model Dwellings: English Housing Reform and the Moralities of Private Space," *Architectural Association Quarterly* 10, no. 1 (1978): 25–35.
 11. Monique Eleb and Anne Debarre, *Architecture domestique et mentalités. Les traités et les pratiques au XIX^e siècle* [research report for the Secrétariat de la recherche architecturale (SRA)], 1984–1985: 104. On the notion of discourse, see also, Roselyne Baillière, Claudine Collet, and Amaro de Villanova, *Incidences du discours sur la mise en forme architecturale: le logement social en France* [research report for the Laboratoire de sciences sociales appliquées à l'urbain (LASSAU)], 1976.
 12. Nicholas Bullock and James Read, *The Movement for Housing Reform in Germany and France, 1840–1914* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Martin J. Daunton (ed.), *Housing the Workers, 1850–1914: A Comparative Perspective* (Leicester, UK: Leicester University Press, 1990).
 13. See, for instance, Christian Topalov (ed.), *Laboratoires du nouveau siècle. La nébuleuse réformatrice et ses réseaux en France, 1880–1914* (Paris, Fr: Éditions de l'EHESS, 1999); Chris Leonards and Nico Randeraad, "Transnational Experts in Social Reform, 1840–1880," *International Review of Social History* 55, no. 2 (2010): 215–39.
 14. Françoise Hamon, "Londres–Paris–Bruxelles (1830–1855). À la recherche du modèle de logement ouvrier," *Monuments historiques*, no. 180 (1992): 36–42; Carmen Van Praet, "The Opposite of Dante's Hell? The Transfer of Ideas for Social Housing at International Congresses in the 1850s–1860s," *Transnational Social Review. A Social Work Journal* 6, no. 3 (2016): 242–61.
 15. Theo van Leeuwen, "Genre and Field in Critical Discourse Analysis: A Synopsis," *Discourse & Society* 4, no. 2 (1993): 193–223.
 16. Thomas A. Markus and Deborah Cameron, *The Words Between the Spaces: Buildings and Language* (London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2002).
 17. See, for instance: Paul Watt, "'Underclass' and 'Ordinary People' Discourses: Representing/Re-presenting Council Tenants in a Housing Campaign," *Critical Discourse Studies* 5, no. 4 (2008): 345–57.
 18. George T. Lemmon, *The Eternal Building or The Making of Manhood* (New York, NY: Eaton & Mains, 1899), 336.
 19. See, for instance, Michael B. Katz, *The Undeserving Poor: America's Enduring Confrontation with Poverty* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2013).
 20. See, for instance, Gérard Noiriel, "Du 'patronage' au 'paternalisme': la restructuration des formes de domination de la main-d'œuvre ouvrière dans l'industrie métallurgique française," *Le Mouvement social*, no. 144 (1988): 17–35; Jean-Pierre Frey, *Le rôle social du patronat, du paternalisme à l'urbanisme* (Paris, Fr: L'Harmattan, 1995); Thomas Adam (ed.), *Philanthropy, Patronage, and Civil Society. Experiences from Germany, Great Britain, and North America* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2004).
 21. Leviticus 19:18; Matthew 5:43, 19:19 and 22:39; Mark 12:31; Luke 10:27 (translation King James Bible).
 22. See also Stephen L. Keck, *Sir Arthur Helps and the Making of Victorianism* (Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013).
 23. Arthur Helps, *The Claims of Labour. An Essay on the Duties of the Employers to the Employed* (London, UK: William Pickering, 1844), 118.
- Passages in italics do not appear in this way in the original sources: I made this choice to highlight certain words or phrases.
24. Abbé Tounissoux, *Le bien-être de l'ouvrier* (Paris: Guillaumin et Cie, 1870), 336: "Un fait tendant à se manifester plus hautement que jamais, c'est l'efficacité des croyances chrétiennes sur le cœur du riche et sur celui du pauvre pour les rapprocher l'un de l'autre. À part de rares exceptions, les riches qui sont sincèrement chrétiens aiment l'ouvrier, ils sont heureux de lui venir en aide moralement et matériellement." [author's translation]
 25. Tounissoux, *Le bien-être de l'ouvrier*, 336.
 26. "Congrès international des habitations à bon marché tenu à Bordeaux les 20, 21 et 22 octobre 1895. Organisation et compte rendu des séances," *Bulletin de la Société française des habitations à bon marché*, vol. 6 (1895), 496: "Dans certains Congrès retentissants, dans certaines réunions, que je n'ai pas besoin de désigner davantage, on aurait pu inscrire à la porte de la salle des séances: Ici, on haït. Leurs organisateurs, leurs promoteurs s'en faisaient gloire. Ils proclamaient cette haine, car elle leur servait d'inspiratrice. Ce n'est pas la nôtre. Celle que nous avons suivie, c'est, selon le mot de M. le premier Président, l'affection de nos semblables; c'est l'amour de tous ceux qui souffrent et dont nous voulons à tout prix améliorer la situation. Les livres saints disent que l'amour est plus fort que la mort; je crois qu'il est aussi plus fort que la haine. À force d'aimer, nous désarmerons. Aux déclamations haineuses, nous opposerons l'enseignement par les faits; et lorsque la France, grâce à cette loi bienfaisante, dont on vient de faire un si juste

éloge, sera couverte de groupes de maisons, [...] je crois qu'alors les fauteurs, les promoteurs des haines n'auront pas beau jeu." [author's translation]

27. "Congrès international des habitations à bon marché tenu à Bordeaux les 20, 21 et 22 octobre 1895," 511: "Il faut avant tout, dans le sens le plus large du mot, des hommes de bonne volonté, c'est-à-dire des hommes fort peu occupés d'eux-mêmes, ne cherchant pas leur intérêt immédiat, aimant le bien pour les satisfactions intimes qu'il donne, ayant à un haut degré l'amour de leurs semblables. Ces hommes existent; il est nécessaire de les trouver. Peu importe le rang qu'ils occupent dans la Société, leurs fonctions habituelles, leurs opinions, leur confession religieuse. Une seule question doit se poser: sont-ils sincèrement dévoués au bien, en dehors de toute arrière-pensée." [author's translation]

28. About the Rothschild Foundation's involvement in the early *habitations à bon marché* movement in France, see Marie-Jeanne Dumont, *Le logement social à Paris, 1850–1930. Les Habitations à Bon Marché* (Fr: Éditions Mardaga, 1991).

29. Christian Topalov, "Les mondes sociaux de la charité parisienne en 1900," *Histoire urbaine* 52, no. 2 (2018): 91–119.

30. Eugène Gautrez, *L'insalubrité publique et l'expropriation* (Paris: J. Rousset, 1907).

31. The preface was reproduced in the SFHBM's *Bulletin*: "Bibliographie. L'insalubrité publique et l'expropriation," *Bulletin de la Société française des habitations à bon marché* 17 (1907): 132–39.

32. James Hole, *The Homes of the Working Classes with Suggestions for Their Improvement* (London, UK: Longmans, Green and Co., 1866), 79–80.

33. Antony Roulliet, *Les habitations ouvrières à l'exposition universelle de 1889 à Paris* (Paris, Fr: Berger-Levrault, 1889), 130: "Dès 1856, la ville, en s'agrandissant, permit de songer utilement au logement de la classe peu aisée; mais l'amour du gain entraîna alors certains

propriétaires à la création de logements mal aérés ou de cités ouvrières qui ont été critiquées." [author's translation]

34. Roulliet, *Les habitations ouvrières à l'exposition universelle de 1889 à Paris*, 131: "À la cave lilloise se trouve ainsi substituée, ou tout au moins le sera dans une certaine mesure, la maison isolée, c'est-à-dire le type amoureusement poursuivi par les apôtres du logement sain et à bon marché." [author's translation]

35. Georges Benoît-Lévy, "Chronique étrangère. Italie," *Bulletin de la Société française des habitations à bon marché* 20 (1910), 410: "Quelle plus belle œuvre, en vérité, peut-il y avoir pour un homme que d'employer son cœur, son intelligence, toutes ses forces, à faire sortir de la terre brute une cité de paix et d'amour [...]?" [author's translation]

36. On the notion of "home" and the working class, see Joseph Harley, Vicky Holmes, and Laika Nevalainen (eds), *The Working Class at Home, 1790–1940* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

37. Monique Eleb-Vidal and Anne Debarre-Blanchard, "Architecture domestique et mentalités. Les traités et les pratiques," *In Extenso*, no. 5 (1985): 76–78.

38. Eugène Viollet-le-Duc, "Dix-huitième entretien. Sur l'architecture privée (suite)," in Eugène Viollet-le-Duc, *Entretiens sur l'architecture. Tome deuxième illustrée de 93 gravures sur bois* (Paris, Fr: A. Morel et Cie, 1872), 304–5: "De bons esprits pensent, non sans apparence de fondement, que l'aspect des locaux a une influence sur les mœurs des habitants. Si cette observation est juste, il faut convenir que rien n'est mieux fait pour démoraliser une population, que ces grandes maisons à loyers dans lesquelles la personnalité de l'individu s'efface et où il n'est guère possible d'admettre l'amour du foyer; par conséquent, les avantages qui en découlent. [...] La maison privée, au contraire, si modeste qu'elle soit, porte toujours l'empreinte des habitudes de son propriétaire. [...] L'homme se prend toujours d'affection pour ce qu'il croit avoir créé, et cette affection, quand elle s'attache au foyer domestique,

est saine. On ne saurait donc, à mon avis, trop favoriser la tendance d'une partie notable du public à abandonner les maisons à locations pour les habitations privées, et il dépend jusqu'à un certain point des architectes d'aider à cette évolution dans les mœurs, en étudiant les moyens les plus économiques, propres à permettre aux fortunes médiocres de s'installer dans des habitations privées." [author's translation]

39. Fani Kostourou, "Mass Factory Housing: Design and Social Reform," *Design Issues* 35, no. 4 (2019): 79–92.

40. Although one could argue that encouraging the worker to buy a house in annuities meant *de facto* forcing him to save.

41. Ludwig Klasen, *Die Arbeiter-Wohnhäuser in ihrer baulichen anlage und ausführung sowie die Anlage von Arbeiter-kolonien* (Leipzig, DE: Karl Scholtze, 1879), 13: "Der Eindruck, den Jedermann beim Anblicke der Häuser und Wohnungen dieser Kolonie empfängt, ist der einer freundlichen Behaglichkeit, die ganz geeignet ist, die Liebe zum eigenen Herd bei den Arbeitern hervorzurufen und Sinn für Ordnung und Reinlichkeit zu wecken." [author's translation]

42. Eugène Viollet-le-Duc, *Entretiens sur l'architecture*, 305: "De l'amour du foyer découle l'amour du travail, de l'ordre et d'une sage économie. Il faut donc faire aimer le foyer, le rendre possible au plus grand nombre et s'évertuer à résoudre ce problème. L'architecte ne saurait s'imposer une plus noble tâche." [author's translation]

43. Several of them did, however, recognise that this type of accommodation was difficult to set up in large cities like Paris, and therefore also explored, sometimes reluctantly, the possibilities offered by collective housing.

44. See, for instance, Stéphane Jonas, *Mulhouse et ses cités ouvrières. Perspective historique* (Strasbourg, Fr: Oberlin, 2003); Will Clement, "The 'Unrealizable Chimera': Workers' Housing in Nineteenth Century Mulhouse," *French History* 32, no. 1 (2018): 66–85.

45. See also Michel Cordillot and Bernard Boller, "LIMOUSIN Charles, Mathieu," *Le Maitron, Dictionnaire biographique, mouvement ouvrier, mouvement social*, published on 18 January 2010, last modified on 6 June 2020, <https://maitron.fr/spip.php?article75960>.

46. Association française pour l'avancement des sciences, *Compte-rendu de la 15e session. Nancy, 1886. Première partie: documents officiels, procès-verbaux* (Paris, Fr: Secrétariat de l'Association, 1887), 236: "Il est bon d'être chez soi, l'amour de la propriété existe chez l'ouvrier comme chez tout homme ; la famille ouvrière qui a sa maison s'intéresse davantage à son intérieur qu'elle aménage à sa fantaisie, au petit coin de jardin qu'elle cultive ; les grandes maisons ouvrières bien ordonnées telles que le familistère de Guise sont très utiles pour le bien-être des ouvriers. M. Levasseur considère cependant la petite maison dont l'ouvrier est propriétaire comme supérieure surtout au point de vue moral."

47. Dr. J. Balmer-Rinck, *Die Wohnung des Arbeiters* (Basel, Ch: C. Detloff, 1883), 7: "Das schönste und idealste Ziel des Bauens von Arbeiterwohnungen bleibt immer der geistig veredelnde Einfluss, den die Heimstätte einer Familie auf deren Glieder auszuüben vermag." [author's translation]

48. "La Famille (de Puteaux). Inauguration du premier groupe de maisons. Dimanche 27 octobre 1901," *Bulletin de la Société française des habitations à bon marché* 12 (1901), 426: "Vous aurez toutes ces satisfactions, messieurs, dans ces charmantes maisons qu'a élevées avec autant d'art que de goût, votre habile architecte, M. Coutelet. En les visitant il y a quelques instants, je remarquais qu'avant même leur complet achèvement, les futurs propriétaires avaient pris possession des murs, en les couvrant de tableaux et de gravures, en disposant leur mobilier avec une heureuse entente qui révèle dès le premier coup d'œil l'amour du foyer. Non seulement les nouveaux habitants y entrent avec joie ; mais ils s'attacheront à leur maison ; ils l'aimeront, elle deviendra une part

de leur vie ; ils verront en elle la prolongation de leur existence, plus certaine de durer qu'eux-mêmes." [author's translation]

49. André Lambert and Eduard Stahl, "VIII^e lettre d'Allemagne à la Construction Moderne," *La Construction moderne* 7 (18 June 1892), 433: "La cité ouvrière, telle quelle a été comprise il y a quelques années encore par les grands industriels, n'a pas toujours produit les résultats qu'on en attendait. La famille était trop parquée dans un cadre monotone et uniforme [...]. Aujourd'hui on s'efforce de donner quelque variété à la maison, de l'isoler, de lui prêter un petit caractère personnel. [...] Ayant constaté dès longtemps l'effet moralisant de la propriété sur la famille pauvre, on s'efforce maintenant d'augmenter cet effet en développant son sentiment esthétique dans la même mesure que son amour du foyer." [author's translation]

50. See, for instance, Ellen Ross, *Love and Toil: Motherhood in Outcast London, 1870-1918* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); Elizabeth Roberts, *A Woman's Place: An Oral History of Working-Class Women, 1890-1940* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1995).

51. Antony Roulliet, *Les habitations ouvrières à l'exposition universelle de 1889 à Paris* (Paris, Fr: Berger-Levrault, 1889), 33: "[...] la propreté du logis est, en effet, la condition première de l'amour qu'il amène avec lui ; à Anzin, où chacun est chez soi, la vie est un peu solitaire. C'est à la femme qu'il appartient de rendre l'intérieur agréable et d'y retenir son mari ; on a dit avec raison que la mère était une école, on peut soutenir que la femme fait et reste l'attrait du logis." [author's translation]

52. René Lavollée, *Les classes ouvrières en Europe. Études sur leur situation matérielle et morale. Tome premier. Allemagne. Pays-Bas. États scandinaves* (Paris: Guillaumin et Cie, 1882), 123: "[...] les jardinets portent l'empreinte de l'amour avec lequel leurs propriétaires les cultivent." [author's translation]

53. Julie-Marie Strange, "Fatherhood, Furniture and the Inter-Personal Dynamics

of Working-Class Homes, c. 1870-1914," *Urban History* 40, no. 2 (2013): 271-86.

54. Louis Rivière, *Les jardins ouvriers en France et à l'étranger* (Paris, Fr: Gaume et Cie, 1899), 101: "L'émulation se produit bien vite entre voisins : on veut d'abord avoir des légumes aussi beaux les autres, puis on veut avoir les plus beaux. Et ce sentiment d'amour-propre dépasse bientôt les petites barrières à claire-voie pour transformer la vie tout entière. La famille est reconstituée. Nous voyions tout à l'heure l'enfant travailler auprès de père, recevoir ses conseils, s'habituer à les solliciter, quand il est dans l'embarras, et apprendre ainsi le respect." [author's translation]

55. "Enquête sur l'habitation ouvrière dans l'arrondissement de Marennes," *Bulletin de la Société française d'habitations à bon marché* 9 (1898), 40: "L'ouvrier en voie de devenir propriétaire d'une habitation saine, d'un petit jardin, s'attache au sol qu'il cultive, à sa maison qu'il améliore, il devient prévoyant, prend goût à l'économie. Les enfants élevés dans ce milieu conservent l'amour du foyer et le respect des parents." [author's translation]

56. "Assemblée générale du 7 mai 1899. Procès-verbal de la séance," *Bulletin de la Société française d'habitations à bon marché* 10 (1899), 162: "Si l'ouvrier se plaît chez lui, l'amour de la famille, principe essentiel de la moralité, pourra germer dans les cœurs ; au lieu de se souvenir avec horreur, comme cela arrive, du logis paternel, les enfants, quand ils l'auront quittée, aimeront à évoquer la douce image de la maison de famille. Ce sera pour eux un réconfort et ils auront le désir de fonder eux-mêmes un foyer semblable, où ils pourront devenir de braves gens et de bons citoyens." [author's translation]

57. See, for instance, Frédéric Krier, "Retour sur la controverse entre Friedrich Engels et Arthur Mühlberger, 'proudhonien' allemand, sur la question du logement," *Revue d'études proudhoniennes*, no. 5 (2019): 257-77.

58. Elsa Vonau, *La Fabrique de l'urbanisme. Les cités-jardins, entre France et Allemagne,*

1900–1924 (Lille, Fr: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 2014), 185–204.

59. Charles Dickens, “*Master Humphrey’s Clock*. Part XXVII. *The Old Curiosity Shop*. Chapter XXXVIII,” *The Evergreen* 1 (1840): 658.

60. Auguste Béchaux, *L’école de la paix sociale devant le socialisme* (Paris: Société d’économie sociale, 1901), 18: “C’est que, pour nous, le foyer domestique, le ‘Heim,’ comme disent les Allemands, n’a pas seulement un charme incomparable, si bien que ce qui est ‘heimlich’ nous retient et nous ravit toujours ; mais l’amour du foyer est aussi l’amour de la patrie, et nous plaignons celui qui, ‘heimatlos,’ ne connaît pas les liens nationaux, parce que trop souvent il n’aura pas connu les liens domestiques ; il est ‘sans feu ni lieu.’ Comment s’étonnent alors qu’il soit internationaliste et collectiviste ?” [author’s translation]

61. “Assemblée générale du 19 juin 1900. Procès-verbal de la séance,” *Bulletin de la Société française des habitations à bon marché* 11 (1900): 139.

62. Alfred de Foville, Introduction to *Enquête sur les conditions de l’habitation en France. Les maisons-types. Avec une introduction de M. Alfred de Foville* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1894), xlvii–xlviii: “Si faible que soit la natalité française, il ne manque pas dans nos campagnes de pauvres gens, de très pauvres gens qui pourraient être tentés d’aller chercher fortune au-delà des mers, comme font tant d’Irlandais, tant d’Allemands, tant d’Italiens. Mais qui sait si ce qui pousse surtout au départ ces Italiens, ces Allemands, ces Irlandais, n’est pas précisément l’ambition et l’espoir d’avoir enfin, là-bas, une maison à eux ? L’amour du foyer qu’ils rêvent l’emporte dans leur cœur, à un moment donné, sur l’amour de la patrie. Le paysan français, ayant ici même sa maison à lui, la patrie et le foyer se trouvent d’accord pour le retenir : et il reste.” [author’s translation]

63. Marie-Jeanne Dumont, *Le logement social à Paris*.

64. Isabel Rousset, *The Architecture of Social Reform:*

Housing, Tradition, and German Modernism (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2022): 151–62.

65. Émile Cardon, *L’art au foyer domestique. La décoration de l’appartement* (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1884), 6: “Les étrangers ont, plus que nous aujourd’hui, cet amour du foyer domestique que nous avons autrefois et que nous avons perdu, hélas, depuis longtemps déjà. Notre intérêt est d’y revenir, car c’est l’amour de la famille et de la maison qui fait l’amour de la patrie et les grandes vertus nationales, si nécessaires à une nation éprouvée comme nous l’avons été.” [author’s translation]

66. Cardon, *L’art au foyer domestique*, 6: “Ce but, c’est incontestablement la femme qui contribuera le plus puissamment à l’atteindre. C’est, nous en avons la conviction, la femme, la première, elle qui a l’instinct du bien et du beau, qui pratiquera le plus activement les conseils destinés à transformer son intérieur ; c’est elle qui se dévouera à cette tâche et la poursuivra avec persévérance, ne fut-ce que pour faire aimer davantage la maison à son mari et à ses enfants, et les y retenir plus longtemps.” [author’s translation]

67. Cardon, *L’art au foyer domestique*, 6.

68. Rossella Froissart Pezone, *L’Art dans Tout. Les arts décoratifs en France et l’utopie d’un Art nouveau* (Paris, Fr: CNRS Éditions, 2016), 84–85.

69. Jean Dacay, “Il faut avoir un foyer,” *Ma Petite Maison*, no. 2 (30 September 1905), 1: “Le home, en effet, est l’élément stable de toute famille, le centre où une lignée d’êtres peut croître et prospérer. L’amour du foyer, le désir de bien être, les principes d’économie, sont les facteurs essentiels du bonheur des peuples et les grandes nations actuelles sont celles où le sentiment de la famille et l’amour du home sont les mieux développés. [...] Une nation n’est grande que par la force de ses enfants. Une famille n’est prospère que par l’amour du foyer.” [author’s translation]

70. “Inauguration des maisons ouvrières construites à Oullins par la Société ‘Le Cottage’ pour les agents de la Compagnie des chemins de fer Paris-Lyon-

Méditerranée,” *Bulletin de la Société française des habitations à bon marché* 3 (1892), 438:

“Un économiste italien Vigano prétendait que chacun de nous a de petites patries concentriques à la grande et que l’amour qu’on a pour sa chaise favorite fait aussi partie du patriotisme. Combien cette boutade, – profonde sous sa forme humoristique, – n’est-elle pas plus vraie pour la maison qu’on possède et qui nous possède aussi ! Cette vérité est encore plus vraie, si c’est possible, lorsque chaque famille a été associée, comme ici, à la construction de sa demeure.” [author’s translation]